



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

ARTHUR PALMER, whose death has made so sensible a void among the classical scholars of our kin over the sea, was not permitted to finish his work on the *Heroides of Ovid* (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press; New York, The Macmillan Co.). The end of the XIVth Epistle had been reached and most of the commentary for XV, XVI, XVII had been written when he relinquished the task, which, at his urgent request, Mr. L. C. PURSER, the Ciceronian scholar, consented to finish. Though Ovid has been called, unjustly in my judgment, 'an inferior Cicero in verse' (A. J. P. IV 209), Professor PURSER demurred on the ground that he had not devoted any special study to Ovid, so that his part of the edition has been done under a quasi-protest. It is interesting to know that PALMER had learned to believe in the Ovidian authorship of the Epistle of Sappho to Phaon (XV) and interesting to study Mr. PURSER's loyal execution of his friend's commission. Of the five last Epistles PALMER held, and held strongly, that they were not written by Ovid, that they were all, with the exception of XVI 39-142, XXI 13 ad fin., written by the same author, and that he lived about the epoch of Petronius or Persius. The general Introduction is an attractive essay and shows, despite Mr. PURSER's demurrer, that he has a juster appreciation of Ovid than some special students of Latin elegiac poetry. The account of the chief MSS is taken chiefly from Sedlmayer, and the section on Planudes is indebted to what Mr. PURSER styles the "admirable treatise" of Professor GUDEMAN. It is unnecessary to say that PALMER's own commentary abounds in fine touches and enhances the regret that a critic and a scholar of such judgment and such insight should have been removed prematurely from the work for which he had such rare endowments. The Greek version of the *Heroides* by Planudes is a welcome addition to the Latin original. In his doctoral dissertation already referred to, Professor GUDEMAN attempted to determine the character of the codex used by Planudes and in some passages bettered the text, VI 47 *Dodonide* for *Tritonide* being a noteworthy instance. But there are many problems left, and the Planudean version suggests a number of questions as to the tradition of translation from Greek into Latin. It is a pity that Planudes was so poor a Latin scholar, but he must have had some school-training, and the 'flatness and baldness' of his trans-

lation, like the flatness and baldness of the Septuagint, are not to be regretted from a comparative any more than from a critical point of view. In the history of translation from Latin into Greek—a history of more importance than much speculation about the original meaning of this and that case and this and that mood—Planudes, late as he is, cannot be neglected.

Goethe has a good word to say for the old-fashioned compilations of 'Elegant Extracts'; classical scholars owe much to ancient anthologies, and I have often yearned for something in the range of Greek literature that should correspond to the 'Old South Leaflets.' To preach about Greek literature and Greek style without illustrations is more or less futile, and the laborious perusal of such a work as Schmid's *Atticismus* would be of less service to the average student than the brisk exposition of half a dozen carefully selected pages of Dion Chrysostomos, Lucian, Philostratos or Aelian. In his *Latin Literature of the Empire* (Harper & Brothers), Professor GUDEMAN has undertaken to supply a like need that every teacher of Latin must have felt, and the first volume, containing the Prose Literature from Velleius to Boethius, is before the public. The notes are critical merely and the introductions are brief. The lecturer will have all the scope he desires. Of course, everybody will not be satisfied with Professor GUDEMAN's limitations. Those who are interested in Christian literature might prefer to have something of Tertullian and Augustin, even if Tacitus, so easily accessible, had to be curtailed and the Ciceronianisms of Minucius Felix reduced to a smaller compass. But we must be thankful for what we have, and make the best use of it as a help to lectures on the literature of the period represented. The student who should attempt to handle the book without a guide might be puzzled. So, to go no farther than the first few pages, in the extract from Seneca Rhetor, p. 5, 24, the novice will find himself forsaken by the critical apparatus. Then the extracts from Velleius skip from Caesar (Julius) to Caesar (Augustus), from Marbod to Tiberius, and the death of Cleopatra is put in the year after the battle at Philippi—the kind of thing the unhappy student once had to contend with in Smith's *History of Greece*. Comp. e. g. Smith, c. XXVIII, §5 (Felton's ed.) with Grote, VI 329. In the extracts from Curtius the dative *Clito* appears as the English form of Clitus in the headline (p. 49). A slip of another order is the use of 'controversial' for 'controverted,' which must be laid to the printer's charge, as Professor GUDEMAN is a native American. Not so easily corrected by the novice are mistakes in the Latin text, and a misplaced comma (p. 34, 34) may bring him to a dead halt. A sharp revision seems to be needed.

In his beautiful edition of *Velleius* (Clarendon Press), Professor ROBINSON ELLIS has made the *Amerbachii Apographon* the basis of his critical work, and has espoused the cause of the young scholar to whom we owe the copy with an affectionate zeal that recalls his enthusiastic characteristic of that youthful genius, Dionysius Salvagnius, to whom he has reared a monument in his edition of the *Ibis*. There is no scholar of our day to whom the erudition of the olden time is so present a reality, as it would be hard to name a scholar who is so much like the men whom he admires in first-hand knowledge.

Scarcely had DÖRPFELD'S great work on the Greek theatre given us a *point de repère*, when new excavations demanded a revision just as imperatively as the onlooker's ground has to be shifted when the diggers are at work. No wonder, then, that Mr. HAIGH, whose book on *The Attic Theatre* came out in 1889, has found a new edition necessary in 1898. The chapters dealing with the theatre and the scenery have been entirely rewritten, and the chapter on the dramatic contests at Athens has been rewritten in parts. While HAIGH now concedes that Dörpfeld has proved conclusively that the stone theatre at Athens was not earlier than the fourth century B. C., he holds with the grip of a Kynaigeiros to the 'old theory,' admitting only that the stage of the fifth century was much lower than that of later times. The new Haigh is nearly a fourth larger than the old, which falls into the limbo of antiquated things. And even as I write, Professor FOSSUM wheels in his *εἰσκύκλημα* (A. J. Archaeology, 1898), the grooves for which he thinks he has discovered in the Eretrian theatre, and, if this is so, another section has to be rewritten. Happy is the man who is not committed to any theory on the subject, who is not forced to say with Kleon: *κυλίνδερ' εἴσω τόνδε τὸν δυσδαίμονα*.

In a recent number of the *Rheinisches Museum* (LIV 1), the well-known Thukydidean scholar, J. M. STAHL, who is not averse to airing his grammatical lore, as he has shown by his *Quaestiones Grammaticae*, complains that the German grammars of Greek take no account of the familiar phenomenon of the predicative participle with the translation of an abstract noun. I have no especial interest in the shortcomings of German grammars of Greek, and the fashionable, desiccated school grammar is not the place where I should look for points of style, so that I have not taken the time to verify Professor STAHL'S statements; but I cannot refrain from expressing my surprise that so mature a

student of Greek as he is should say that the only poetic example known to him is Ar. Nub. 1241: Ζεὺς γελοῖος ὀμνύμενος τοῖς εἰδόσιν, which he renders 'der Schwur beim Zeus ist den Wissenden lächerlich.' The construction goes back to Homer (see A. J. P. XIII 258), e. g. Il. 14, 504: ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ ἐλθόντι γανύσσεται, and 13, 35, where Monro translates νοστήσαντα ἄνακτα 'the return of the master.' Pindar delights in the construction, for which see my Introductory Essay (cxiii), though that passage was written before I had learned that the frequency of the construction in Latin is a frequency in certain authors only (see A. J. P., l. c.). True, the translation by the abstract noun destroys the concreteness of the participle, and Lysias I, 8: πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἀποθανοῦσα (sc. ἡ μήτηρ) αἰτία μοι γεγένηται the participle is much more plastic than the abstract noun would have been; but that is a matter that really transcends the province of the school grammar.

I have frequently had occasion to animadvert on the slender attainments of the average German classical scholar in the matter of English, and as some persons have thought that I have thereby done injustice to the learned confraternity of Teutondom, I take from the November (1898) number of the *Berliner Zeitschrift für Gymnasialwesen* the following passage, in a review by H. ZIEMER of the German translation of LINDSAY'S *Latin Language*: "(Es) beherrschen in Deutschland die klassischen Philologen die englische Sprache nicht in dem Grade wie die englischen mit der deutschen vertraut sind." Some years ago Gustav Meyer, in the *Berliner Wochenschrift* (July 27, 1895), said: "Unsere klassischen Philologen lesen noch immer nicht Englisch mit der wünschenswerten Geläufigkeit." And other unsuspected witnesses might be produced to this unwelcome fact—especially unwelcome to American scholars, many of whom look to Germany as to a court of appeal. To be judged by those who do not understand, or only half understand, the language of the pleaders is not exactly the treatment one would expect to receive in the republic of letters. Of course, it will be urged that the best things, like Grote, like Jebb, like Lindsay, compel translation, and that enterprising scholars see to it that their lucubrations are translated into German when they are not composed in German; but there are those who are not willing to yield the primacy of the English language, and, as I have suggested before (A. J. P. XV 398), a return to Latin seems to be one of the possibilities. The Americano-Hungarian *Sermo Latinus* has found an echo in the Roman *Vox Urbis*, and these signs of the times are not to be disregarded. But perhaps English-speaking Hellenists will prefer to follow Wecklein's example, and the Ζωγράφειος Ἑλληνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη will furnish a pattern to classical scholars of all nationalities. *Hoc Ithacus velit*, and the Ithacan is the one enduring Greek type.

The Editor of this Journal never intended to monopolize *Brief Mention*, and he has been trying for some time to make arrangements for the extension of this department and for bringing about a variety in its tone and in its themes. *Brief Mention* ought to be a file-closer, not a stop-gap, nor yet an Editor's Table for the display of Hippokleidean arts or Hippokleidean unconcern. In this number a beginning has been made, and a projected notice of WAIT'S *Lysias* is gladly abandoned in favor of a contribution by a new hand.

E. L. G.: DR. WILLIAM H. WAIT, who has put forth an annotated edition of *Ten Selected Orations of Lysias* (American Book Co.), intends to have his notes meet the needs of young beginners, especially those in the first year at college. "Hence," he says, his "grammatical notes may seem rather full," but the notes consist in great part of references to the grammars of Hadley and Goodwin, and many important and interesting phenomena pass unnoticed, such as ὥς after φησίν, VII 19 (see A. J. P. XVI 396); as ὥς final, XXXVIII 14, the only example in Lysias (A. J. P. IV 419, note). At the same time, the student in his freshman year is supposed to be familiar with such works as "Kühner-Blass," "Meist." (Meisterhans), "Müller, Handbuch," "Lobeck, Phryn.," and a score of others. Becker's Charicles is cited by the English edition with the page and volume of the German. References to Gilbert's Constitutional Antiquities are sometimes to the English, sometimes to the German edition. A large part of the notes terminate in an interrogation point, an irritating trick, which ought to be, if it is not, out of date. The text is not free from typographical blunders. The notes are far worse. Scarcely a page is clean. The editor's hand is hardly familiar with the useful, not to say indispensable, art of accentuation. One trouble, and a great trouble, is that the notes follow a different reading from that which appears in the text. XII 28 we have ἄν in the notes and εἰάν in the text; 72, ἀπειλοῖ in the notes, διαπειλοῖτο in the text. XII 48, πλασθέντα is said to come from πλάζω. Omitted ἐστὶ's are carefully supplied, but that does not make up for the omission of the numbers in the headlines, which increases the difficulty of following the references. XXXII 26, 'fifty talents' should be 'twenty-four minae.' XVI 16, ἀγαπητῶς is translated with a 'feeling of pleasure,' and not 'barely,' which the student will find with the reference in Liddell and Scott. The map puts Cynoscephalae in Epirus and Coronea in Thessaly, and in spite of his own Index the editor seems to suppose the Πόντος of Satyrus (XVI 4; cf. XXII 14) to be the same as the Pontus of Asia Minor. In short, the editor has not learned the lesson that nothing requires more mature scholarship or riper judgment than the preparation of an edition for beginners.

M. W.: That after eight years a new edition of the first part of MARTIN SCHANZ'S *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, in

Müller's Handbuch, should be demanded, is not surprising, but it is nevertheless a severe test to the patience of the subscriber to have the concluding part of the history deferred for a year or more by the necessity of this revision. Schanz himself apologizes therefor. The new edition shows an increase of over one hundred pages, and is not only amplified but in many respects improved, although it follows the general lines laid down in the first edition, in the disposition of the material and the attempt to give a general idea of the content of the various literary works and the results of modern discussions about them. The sections on Plautus and Terence and the drama in general, on Cicero, Caesar, Lucretius and Catullus show considerable changes. The new literature relative to the republican period has been most carefully reviewed, which does not mean that all new views and theories have been accepted. Schanz preserves everywhere his independence of judgment. He still follows Drumann's opinion of Cicero, and is not much affected by the attitude of Aly and Zielinski. Leo's new theories on Plautus and Marx's views as to the *Libri ad Herennium* get scant recognition. The Saturnian verse is still for Schanz quantitative, the dramatic satura, 'Bockscherz,' is not banished out of existence, and there are other evidences of conservatism. A little more care might be taken with the English names. Peace is printed for Pease on p. 89 and Cosh for M'Cosh on p. 49. Why the latter's edition of the *Bacchides* (1896), the most unscholarly edition of any Plautine play which has appeared in recent times, should be mentioned at all, we hardly understand. It evinces, at any rate, the editor's desire not to ignore recent literature. The new revision must find its place in the library of every Latin professor who wishes to be 'up to date.' An Alphabetisches Register at the end of the volume, lacking in the first edition, greatly facilitates reference.

M. W.: It was a happy idea to collect in one volume the scattered articles of the late Professor BRUNN which bear upon Roman and Etruscan monuments (Teubner). These range in date from 1844-85 and the greater number are in Italian. We are told in the preface that Brunn was averse to a German translation being made of these, holding that the same idea must be expressed differently in German and Italian, the latter language demanding a more concrete and elementary exposition. The articles have to do with various sarcophagi, vases, mirrors, bronzes, terra-cottas, and Etruscan paintings, and the clear and genial interpretation of the distinguished critic has an abiding value, even though his views may long since have been accepted, modified or abandoned. No one better appreciated than Brunn the value of ancient works of art for the illustration of ancient literature, and to read his work is to be convinced that archae-

ology and philology are mutually interdependent. A sarcophagus may admirably elucidate the epithalamion of Statius, an altar with its sculptured sides may furnish a commentary to an ode of Horace, and the interpretation of Ovid would greatly gain in vividness, if the classical editor were better acquainted with the ancient monuments. On this ground, if for no other, we recommend the perusal of this book to the classical philologist, and from this point of view the following articles are especially interesting: *Sarcofago rappresentante ceremonie nuziali*, *Die Ara Casali*, *Giunone Lucina*, *Vatikanischer Relief-pilaster*, *I monumenti degli Aterii*. The book is richly illustrated, and most of the illustrations are good, though some of them lack distinctness.